

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 121326  
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-15 CU-02 DODE-00 NSC-05 CIAE-00  
PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07 NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01  
SP-02 TRSE-00 SSO-00 INRE-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 /060 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:JJMARESCA  
APPROVED BY EUR:JAARMITAGE  
D:MR. OXMAN  
C:RHOPPER

-----260011Z 046540 /72

O R 252328Z MAY 77  
FM SECSTATE WASHDC  
TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE  
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 121326

HOLD FOR OPENING OF BUSINESS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE: DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" FOR BELGRADE  
PREP MEETING -

REF: A) USNATO 3932; B) USNATO 3868; C) USNATO 3774;  
-- D) USNATO 3948

1. WE APPRECIATE TURKISH AND FRG CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORK ON  
DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" AND IS EFFORT TO ADVANCE NATO WORK  
PROGRAM. IS COULD PERHAPS USEFULLY TRY TO SYNTHESIZE  
CONTRIBUTIONS AND POLADS' DISCUSSIONS AND PRODUCE A  
CONSOLIDATED DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" FOR FURTHER REVIEW IN  
CAPITALS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 121326

2. OUR CONCEPTION OF DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" FOR TABLING  
AT OPENING OF BELGRADE PREPARATORY MEETING IS A DOCUMENT  
WHICH REPRESENTS IN DRAFT FORM, FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE  
FULL CSCE, THE DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN BY THE PREPARATORY  
MEETING, AS INDICATED IN OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE  
FOLLOW-UP SECTION OF THE FINAL ACT. THE PURPOSE OF  
TABLING THIS DRAFT PAPER AT THE OUTSET OF THE PREPARATORY

MEETING WOULD BE TO FOCUS DISCUSSION IMMEDIATELY ON THE CONCRETE TASKS SET FOR THE PREPARATORY MEETING IN THAT PARAGRAPH, IN AN EFFORT TO AVOID A THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

OF A "POLITICAL CONCEPT" FOR THE MAIN MEETING OR AN EXTENDED DEBATE ON THE WORK OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING ITSELF. FOR THIS REASON THE DRAFT PRESENTED BY THE WEST SHOULD BE PROCEDURALLY UNIMPEACHABLE, AND SHOULD BE DRAFTED AS ACTUAL PROPOSED DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN AT THE PREPARATORY MEETING.

3. TO MEET THESE CRITERIA, WE BELIEVE IT IS NECESSARY THAT THE "DECISION SHEET" BE CLEARLY DIVIDED INTO SECTIONS DEVOTED TO THOSE ISSUES ON WHICH THE PREPARATORY MEETING IS EMPOWERED BY THE FINAL ACT TO "DECIDE." THESE ARE THE "THE DATE, DURATION, AGENDA AND OTHER MODALITIES" OF THE MAIN MEETING. THE DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" SHOULD COVER THESE ISSUES AND NO OTHERS. THE HEADINGS SHOULD BE THOSE USED BY THE FINAL ACT: "DATE," "DURATION," "AGENDA," AND "OTHER MODALITIES," IN THAT ORDER.

4. TAKING THESE ITEMS IN ORDER, OUR GENERAL VIEWS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

A) DATE: WE PREFER AN OPENING DATE FOR THE MAIN MEETING AT THE BEGINNING OF OCTOBER. IN ORDER TO FOCUS DISCUSSION, WE WOULD PREFER TO INDICATE A SPECIFIC DATE, AND CAN ACCEPT OCTOBER 3 (FIRST MONDAY IN OCTOBER), AS SUGGESTED IN EC-9 DRAFT.  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 121326

B) DURATION: WE WOULD PREFER USING LANGUAGE ON DURATION CONTAINED IN CM(77)29. AS AN ALTERNATIVE, WE CAN ALSO ACCEPT LANGUAGE ADOPTED BY EC-9 CSCE WORKING GROUP (SEE LONDON 8607). OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THAT LANGUAGE IS CONTAINED IN STATE 119095.

C) AGENDA: WE BELIEVE ALLIED MINISTERS BY APPROVING DOCUMENT CM(77)29 HAVE ALREADY APPROVED THE DRAFT AGENDA SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 74 OF THAT DOCUMENT. WE WOULD PREFER TO SEE THAT AGENDA REPRODUCED IN THE DRAFT "DECISION SHEET."

D) OTHER MODALITIES: THIS SECTION SHOULD COVER WORK PROCEDURES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS. WE WOULD ENVISAGE INCLUDING SOMETHING LIKE THE FRG PAPER ON PROCEDURES UNDER THIS HEADING. WE WOULD PREFER A SECTION ON PROCEDURES WHICH IS AS BRIEF AS POSSIBLE AND WHICH REAFFIRMS EXISTING PROCEDURES AND DESCRIBES

SPECIFICALLY ONLY THOSE PROCEDURES WHICH MUST BE CHANGED BECAUSE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BELGRADE MEETINGS AND THOSE OF THE CSCE ITSELF. WE BELIEVE ALLIES SHOULD CONSIDER CAREFULLY THE EFFECT ON THE PROCEDURAL RULES WHICH ARE NOT REPEAT NOT QUOTED OF A PAPER WHICH DOES SPECIFICALLY QUOTE SOME OTHER RULES. SHOULD ALLIES, HOWEVER, STRONGLY PREFER TO REITERATE MORE PROCEDURES THAN SIMPLY THOSE WHICH MUST BE CHANGED, YOU MAY GO ALONG WITH THE MAJORITY. YOU MAY ALSO ACCEPT MAJORITY VIEW IF THERE IS A STRONG PREFERENCE TO INCLUDE BULK OF PROCEDURAL RULES IN AN ANNEX. WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFIC POINTS CONTAINED IN THE FRG PAPER ON PROCEDURES.

5. WE FORESEE THE NEED FOR TWO ANNEXES--ONE SETTING OUT A SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS FOR THE MAIN MEETING, AND ANOTHER RECORDING THE ORDER OF SPEAKERS FOR THE CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 121326

INAUGURAL SESSION, AS ESTABLISHED BY THE DRAWING OF LOTS. WE BELIEVE THE FRG DRAFT TIME SCHEDULE FOR THE MAIN MEETING IS NOT SUFFICIENTLY PRECISE TO AVOID PROBLEMS DURING THE MAIN MEETING. THE DECISION SHEET SHOULD ALSO MAKE CLEAR, HOWEVER, THAT THE SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS SET OUT IN THE ANNEX IS ILLUSTRATIVE IN NATURE AND NOT IMMUTABLE. IT CAN BE MODIFIED AT ANY TIME BY THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE, WHICH IS EMPOWERED TO ADD OR SUBTRACT MEETINGS OR MAKE OTHER ADJUSTMENTS TO SUIT THE FLOW OF THE CONFERENCE. OTHERWISE WE FEAR THAT SCHEDULE AS PRESENTLY INDICATED WILL AMOUNT TO SETTING A TERMINAL DATE FOR THE MEETING. OUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON FRG DRAFT ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1) ACTUAL PREFERRED DURATION OF INAUGURAL ROUND SHOULD BE INDICATED (FOR EXAMPLE, CALCULATING ON BASIS OF APPROXIMATELY 50 MINUTES PER SPEAKER FOR 35 SPEAKERS DURING 6-HOUR WORKING DAY INAUGURAL SESSION WOULD RUN FOR 5 DAYS). ALSO, ADD PHRASE "...IN ACCORDANCE WITH ORDER OF SPEAKERS AS SET OUT IN ANNEX II."

2) AS WE HAVE STATED EARLIER, WE BELIEVE ALLIES SHOULD RETAIN SOME FLEXIBILITY ON WHETHER OR NOT AN EVALUATION PHASE IN CLOSED PLENARY IS REQUIRED. WE WOULD PREFER TO MOVE TO EVALUATION IN COMMITTEES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

3) WE BELIEVE CLEAR SEPARATION SHOULD BE MADE BETWEEN DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS IN ORDER TO AVOID EVALUATION BEING OBSCURED BY SIMULTANEOUS DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS. ALSO, WE DO NOT BELIEVE

FIVE WEEKS WILL BE SUFFICIENT FOR BOTH OF THESE DISCUSSIONS. IT WILL CERTAINLY NOT SUFFICE FOR DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS UNLESS ALLIES DRASTICALLY CUT BACK THE LIST OF POSSIBLE NEW PROPOSALS WHICH THEY ARE CONSIDERING UNDER ALL SUBJECT HEADINGS. AS ALLIES KNOW, WE HAVE  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 121326

URGED THIS FOR SOME TIME.

4) IT SHOULD BE CLEAR FROM THE SCHEDULE THAT THE WORK OF THE AD HOC GROUP ON FOLLOW-UP WILL NOT BEGIN UNTIL SOME TIME HAS ELAPSED, TO PERMIT EVALUATION OF HOW THE FIRST REVIEW MEETING IS GOING BEFORE REACHING A DECISION ON HOLDING OTHER SUCH MEETINGS. ALSO, WE BELIEVE DISCUSSION OF FOLLOW-UP CAN RUN PARALLEL TO, AND NEED NOT TAKE PLACE AFTER THE DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION AND NEW PROPOSALS IN COMMITTEES.

5) COORDINATING COMMITTEE COULD BE PUTTING TOGETHER CONCLUDING DOCUMENT IN PARALLEL WITH COMMITTEE WORK.

6) A LIST OF SPEAKERS SHOULD PROBABLY ALSO BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE CLOSING PLENARY DURING THE PREPARATORY MEETING, IN ORDER TO AVOID THIS PROBLEM DURING THE MAIN MEETING.

5. WE HAVE SEVERAL QUESTIONS REGARDING TURKISH PAPER TRANSMITTED BY REFS (C) AND (D):

A) WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND REFERENCE IN TURKISH PARA II-4 TO "ELEVEN PUBLIC SESSIONS ARE ENVISAGED FROM THE 15TH TO THE 22ND OF JUNE, 1977 FOR THE OPENING ADDRESSES." DO TURKS MEAN FROM "3RD TO 10TH OF OCTOBER, 1977?"

B) WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND DERIVATION OF AGENDA PROPOSED IN PARA III BY TURKS, ESPECIALLY SINCE ALLIED MINISTERS HAVE ALREADY APPROVED AGENDA SET OUT IN PARA 74 OF CM(77)29. IN ANY CASE WE DO NOT BELIEVE DRAFTING SHOULD (OR CAN) BE SEPARATED FROM REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OR CONSIDERATION OF NEW PROPOSALS.

C) WE DO NOT AGREE WITH LANGUAGE ON DURATION CONTAINED IN TURKISH PARA V-1, AND PREFER LANGUAGE IN LONDON 8607.  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 121326

D) IS TURKISH INTENTION IN PARA VI-1 THAT LIBYA  
AND LEBANON SHOULD ALSO BE INVITED? WE WOULD PREFER  
TO STICK TO PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY CSCE ITSELF AND  
HAVE INVITATIONS GO TO THE SIX NON-PARTICIPATING  
MEDITERRANEAN STATES WHICH CONTRIBUTED TO THE CSCE, TO  
MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMITTEES FOR BASKETS I  
AND II.

E) WE HAVE SOME DOUBTS AS TO ADVISABILITY OF TRYING  
TO AGREE IN ADVANCE ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE CONCLUDING  
DOCUMENT, AS SUGGESTED IN TURKISH PARA VII. DO  
ALLIES BELIEVE THIS IS NECESSARY, DESIRABLE, OR  
FEASIBLE?

6. PLEASE TRANSMIT FULL DRAFT "DECISION SHEET," INCLUDING  
ALL ANNEXES, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 121326  
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /013 R

66011

DRAFTED BY: EUR/RPM:JKORNBLUM

APPROVED BY: EUR/RPM:WSHINN, JR.

-----140451Z 057765 /23

P 140115Z JUN 77

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY BELGRADE PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 121326

FOLLOWING REPEAT STATE 121326 SENT ACTION NATO INFO ALL NATO  
CAPITALS 25 MAY 77

QUOTE C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 121326

HOLD FOR OPENING OF BUSINESS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE: DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" FOR BELGRADE

PREP MEETING -

REF: A) USNATO 3932; B) USNATO 3868; C) USNATO 3774;  
-- D) USNATO 3948

1. WE APPRECIATE TURKISH AND FRG CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORK ON DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" AND IS EFFORT TO ADVANCE NATO WORK PROGRAM. IS COULD PERHAPS USEFULLY TRY TO SYNTHESIZE CONTRIBUTIONS AND POLADS' DISCUSSIONS AND PRODUCE A CONSOLIDATED DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" FOR FURTHER REVIEW IN CAPITALS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 121326

2. OUR CONCEPTION OF DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" FOR TABLING AT OPENING OF BELGRADE PREPARATORY MEETING IS A DOCUMENT WHICH REPRESENTS IN DRAFT FORM, FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE FULL CSCE, THE DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN BY THE PREPARATORY MEETING, AS INDICATED IN OPERATIVE PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE FOLLOW-UP SECTION OF THE FINAL ACT. THE PURPOSE OF TABLING THIS DRAFT PAPER AT THE OUTSET OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING WOULD BE TO FOCUS DISCUSSION IMMEDIATELY ON THE CONCRETE TASKS SET FOR THE PREPARATORY MEETING IN THAT PARAGRAPH, IN AN EFFORT TO AVOID A THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

OF A "POLITICAL CONCEPT" FOR THE MAIN MEETING OR AN EXTENDED DEBATE ON THE WORK OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING ITSELF. FOR THIS REASON THE DRAFT PRESENTED BY THE WEST SHOULD BE PROCEDURALLY UNIMPEACHABLE, AND SHOULD BE DRAFTED AS ACTUAL PROPOSED DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN AT THE PREPARATORY MEETING.

3. TO MEET THESE CRITERIA, WE BELIEVE IT IS NECESSARY THAT THE "DECISION SHEET" BE CLEARLY DIVIDED INTO SECTIONS DEVOTED TO THOSE ISSUES ON WHICH THE PREPARATORY MEETING IS EMPOWERED BY THE FINAL ACT TO "DECIDE." THESE ARE THE "THE DATE, DURATION, AGENDA AND OTHER MODALITIES" OF THE MAIN MEETING. THE DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" SHOULD COVER THESE ISSUES AND NO OTHERS. THE HEADINGS SHOULD BE THOSE USED BY THE FINAL ACT: "DATE," "DURATION," "AGENDA," AND "OTHER MODALITIES," IN THAT ORDER.

4. TAKING THESE ITEMS IN ORDER, OUR GENERAL VIEWS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

A) DATE: WE PREFER AN OPENING DATE FOR THE MAIN MEETING AT THE BEGINNING OF OCTOBER. IN ORDER TO FOCUS DISCUSSION, WE WOULD PREFER TO INDICATE A SPECIFIC DATE, AND CAN ACCEPT OCTOBER 3 (FIRST MONDAY IN OCTOBER),  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 121326

AS SUGGESTED IN EC-9 DRAFT.

B) DURATION: WE WOULD PREFER USING LANGUAGE ON DURATION CONTAINED IN CM(77)29. AS AN ALTERNATIVE, WE CAN ALSO ACCEPT LANGUAGE ADOPTED BY EC-9 CSCE WORKING GROUP (SEE LONDON 8607). OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THAT LANGUAGE IS CONTAINED IN STATE 119095.

C) AGENDA: WE BELIEVE ALLIED MINISTERS BY APPROVING DOCUMENT CM(77)29 HAVE ALREADY APPROVED THE DRAFT AGENDA SET OUT IN PARAGRAPH 74 OF THAT DOCUMENT. WE WOULD PREFER TO SEE THAT AGENDA REPRODUCED IN THE DRAFT "DECISION SHEET."

D) OTHER MODALITIES: THIS SECTION SHOULD COVER WORK PROCEDURES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS. WE WOULD ENVISAGE INCLUDING SOMETHING LIKE THE FRG PAPER ON PROCEDURES UNDER THIS HEADING. WE WOULD PREFER A SECTION ON PROCEDURES WHICH IS AS BRIEF AS POSSIBLE AND WHICH REAFFIRMS EXISTING PROCEDURES AND DESCRIBES SPECIFICALLY ONLY THOSE PROCEDURES WHICH MUST BE CHANGED BECAUSE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BELGRADE MEETINGS AND THOSE OF THE CSCE ITSELF. WE BELIEVE ALLIES SHOULD CONSIDER CAREFULLY THE EFFECT ON THE PROCEDURAL RULES WHICH ARE NOT REPEAT NOT QUOTED OF A PAPER WHICH DOES SPECIFICALLY QUOTE SOME OTHER RULES. SHOULD ALLIES, HOWEVER, STRONGLY PREFER TO REITERATE MORE PROCEDURES THAN SIMPLY THOSE WHICH MUST BE CHANGED, YOU MAY GO ALONG WITH THE MAJORITY. YOU MAY ALSO ACCEPT MAJORITY VIEW IF THERE IS A STRONG PREFERENCE TO INCLUDE BULK OF PROCEDURAL RULES IN AN ANNEX. WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFIC POINTS CONTAINED IN THE FRG PAPER ON PROCEDURES.

5. WE FORESEE THE NEED FOR TWO ANNEXES--ONE SETTING OUT A SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS FOR THE MAIN MEETING,  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 121326

AND ANOTHER RECORDING THE ORDER OF SPEAKERS FOR THE INAUGURAL SESSION, AS ESTABLISHED BY THE DRAWING OF LOTS. WE BELIEVE THE FRG DRAFT TIME SCHEDULE FOR THE MAIN MEETING IS NOT SUFFICIENTLY PRECISE TO AVOID PROBLEMS DURING THE MAIN MEETING. THE DECISION SHEET SHOULD ALSO MAKE CLEAR, HOWEVER, THAT THE SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS SET OUT IN THE ANNEX IS ILLUSTRATIVE IN

NATURE AND NOT IMMUTABLE. IT CAN BE MODIFIED AT ANY TIME BY THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE, WHICH IS EMPOWERED TO ADD OR SUBTRACT MEETINGS OR MAKE OTHER ADJUSTMENTS TO SUIT THE FLOW OF THE CONFERENCE. OTHERWISE WE FEAR THAT SCHEDULE AS PRESENTLY INDICATED WILL AMOUNT TO SETTING A TERMINAL DATE FOR THE MEETING. OUR SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON FRG DRAFT ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1) ACTUAL PREFERRED DURATION OF INAUGURAL ROUND SHOULD BE INDICATED (FOR EXAMPLE, CALCULATING ON BASIS OF APPROXIMATELY 50 MINUTES PER SPEAKER FOR 35 SPEAKERS DURING 6-HOUR WORKING DAY INAUGURAL SESSION WOULD RUN FOR 5 DAYS). ALSO, ADD PHRASE "...IN ACCORDANCE WITH ORDER OF SPEAKERS AS SET OUT IN ANNEX II."

2) AS WE HAVE STATED EARLIER, WE BELIEVE ALLIES SHOULD RETAIN SOME FLEXIBILITY ON WHETHER OR NOT AN EVALUATION PHASE IN CLOSED PLENARY IS REQUIRED. WE WOULD PREFER TO MOVE TO EVALUATION IN COMMITTEES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

3) WE BELIEVE CLEAR SEPARATION SHOULD BE MADE BETWEEN DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS IN ORDER TO AVOID EVALUATION BEING OBSCURED BY SIMULTANEOUS DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS. ALSO, WE DO NOT BELIEVE FIVE WEEKS WILL BE SUFFICIENT FOR BOTH OF THESE DISCUSSIONS. IT WILL CERTAINLY NOT SUFFICE FOR DISCUSSION OF NEW PROPOSALS UNLESS ALLIES DRASTICALLY CUT BACK THE LIST OF POSSIBLE NEW PROPOSALS WHICH THEY ARE CONSIDERING CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 121326

UNDER ALL SUBJECT HEADINGS. AS ALLIES KNOW, WE HAVE URGED THIS FOR SOME TIME.

4) IT SHOULD BE CLEAR FROM THE SCHEDULE THAT THE WORK OF THE AD HOC GROUP ON FOLLOW-UP WILL NOT BEGIN UNTIL SOME TIME HAS ELAPSED, TO PERMIT EVALUATION OF HOW THE FIRST REVIEW MEETING IS GOING BEFORE REACHING A DECISION ON HOLDING OTHER SUCH MEETINGS. ALSO, WE BELIEVE DISCUSSION OF FOLLOW-UP CAN RUN PARALLEL TO, AND NEED NOT TAKE PLACE AFTER THE DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION AND NEW PROPOSALS IN COMMITTEES.

5) COORDINATING COMMITTEE COULD BE PUTTING TOGETHER CONCLUDING DOCUMENT IN PARALLEL WITH COMMITTEE WORK.

6) A LIST OF SPEAKERS SHOULD PROBABLY ALSO BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE CLOSING PLENARY DURING THE PREPARATORY MEETING, IN ORDER TO AVOID THIS PROBLEM DURING THE MAIN MEETING.



5. WE HAVE SEVERAL QUESTIONS REGARDING TURKISH PAPER TRANSMITTED BY REFS (C) AND (D):

A) WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND REFERENCE IN TURKISH PARA II-4 TO "ELEVEN PUBLIC SESSIONS ARE ENVISAGED FROM THE 15TH TO THE 22ND OF JUNE, 1977 FOR THE OPENING ADDRESSES." DO TURKS MEAN FROM "3RD TO 10TH OF OCTOBER, 1977?"

B) WE DO NOT UNDERSTAND DERIVATION OF AGENDA PROPOSED IN PARA III BY TURKS, ESPECIALLY SINCE ALLIED MINISTERS HAVE ALREADY APPROVED AGENDA SET OUT IN PARA 74 OF CM(77)29. IN ANY CASE WE DO NOT BELIEVE DRAFTING SHOULD (OR CAN) BE SEPARATED FROM REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OR CONSIDERATION OF NEW PROPOSALS.

C) WE DO NOT AGREE WITH LANGUAGE ON DURATION CONTAINED  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 121326

IN TURKISH PARA V-1, AND PREFER LANGUAGE IN LONDON 8607.

D) IS TURKISH INTENTION IN PARA VI-1 THAT LIBYA AND LEBANON SHOULD ALSO BE INVITED? WE WOULD PREFER TO STICK TO PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY CSCE ITSELF AND HAVE INVITATIONS GO TO THE SIX NON-PARTICIPATING MEDITERRANEAN STATES WHICH CONTRIBUTED TO THE CSCE, TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMITTEES FOR BASKETS I AND II.

E) WE HAVE SOME DOUBTS AS TO ADVISABILITY OF TRYING TO AGREE IN ADVANCE ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE CONCLUDING DOCUMENT, AS SUGGESTED IN TURKISH PARA VII. DO ALLIES BELIEVE THIS IS NECESSARY, DESIRABLE, OR FEASIBLE?

6. PLEASE TRANSMIT FULL DRAFT "DECISION SHEET," INCLUDING ALL ANNEXES, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. VANCE

UNQUOTE VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** AGREEMENT DRAFT, PLANNING MEETINGS, COLLECTIVE SECURITY AGREEMENTS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 25-May-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977STATE121326  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** JJMARESCA  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D770187-0671  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19770517/aaaaaovx.tel  
**Line Count:** 483  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 55b2bc89-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ORIGIN EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 9  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 30-Mar-2005 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 2366087  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE: DRAFT "DECISION SHEET" FOR BELGRADE PREP MEETING -  
**TAGS:** PARM, PFOR, OCON, CSCE, NATO  
**To:** NATO BRUSSELS  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/55b2bc89-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009